

(2)

Public Attitudes Towards Security and Counter-Espionage Matters in the Post Cold-War Period

by

**Tom W. Smith
National Opinion Research Center**



**A Grant Report Submitted to the Security Awareness Area of the
Personnel Security Research Institutional Award Program**

Defense Personnel Security Research Center (PERSEREC)

19950509 103

November 1994



This project was completed under a grant from the Defense Personnel Security Research Center (PERSEREC) of the U.S. Department of Defense, Monterey, California. The views and conclusions expressed in this report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of PERSEREC, ONR, DoD, or the National Opinion Research Center.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS			
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY		3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT			
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)			
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Defense Personnel Security Research Center		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL	7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION		
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 99 Pacific St Suite 455-E Monterey, CA 93940		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)			
8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION DEFENSE PERSONNEL SECURITY RESEARCH CENTER (PERSEREC)		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL	9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER		
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 99 PACIFIC ST, BLDG 455-E MONTEREY, CA 93940-2481		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO.	PROJECT NO.	TASK NO.	
		WORK UNIT ACCESSIO N NO.			
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) Public Attitudes Towards Security and Counter-Espionage Matters in the Post Cold-War Period					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Tom W. Smith, National Opinion Research Center					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical	13b. TIME COVERED FROM: TO:		14. DATE OF REPORT 94-11	15. PAGE COUNT 26	
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES		18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) Public attitudes, opinions, values, security, personnel security, secrecy, investigations			
FIELD	GROUP				SUBGROUP
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) A national survey was conducted in 1994 on a representative sample of U.S. adult households to assess the climate of public opinion on a number of security-related issues. The findings suggest that, despite concern that the government classifies too many documents, U.S. citizens favor maintaining a high level of secrecy surrounding technology with military uses. U.S. citizens also favor the government's right to ask detailed, personal questions before giving an individual a security clearance. In addition, in matters of national security, people are willing to give up some of their right to personal privacy and favor reporting coworkers who violate security rules.					
20. DISTRIBUTION OF ABSTRACT _ UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED _ SAME AS RPT _ DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL ROGER P. DENK, Director			22b. TELEPHONE (408) 656-2448	22c. OFFICE SYMBOL	

Preface

Public opinion impacts on security in many ways. Specifically, public opinions affect: (1) the quality and quantity of potential employees, (2) the resolve of current employees to remain both diligent and loyal, (3) the dedication and ability of security personnel to carry out their duties, and (4) the passage of legislation and regulations about permissible counterespionage measures such as wiretaps, employment screening, and background checks.

While less than two percent of the American population, at any given time, actually holds a security clearance, most adult Americans have formed opinions about security, clearances, and government secrecy. We should be able to discern what the American public thinks and provide useful public opinion information to security policy-makers and practitioners. To accomplish this the Defense Personnel Security Research Center has sponsored a series of studies designed to assess the state of various security-related opinions and the likely direction of these opinions in the future. In 1991 we published *Security Awareness and the Climate of Public Opinion: With Special Attention to Financial and Credit Issues*. In 1993 we issued the report *Security Awareness and the Climate of Public Opinion: An Analysis of Recent Trends*. In both of these studies we analyzed survey data collected by other researchers around the nation.

This report documents the results of our latest effort in which we developed our own survey items to tap into issues we thought particularly relevant to Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community. These items were included in the 1994 General Social Survey fielded by the National Opinion Research Center. This survey was administered to a national sample of the adult household population of the United States. Fifteen hundred respondents were asked their opinions regarding the need for secrecy, the extent to which secrecy is over-used, reporting adverse information about co-workers, and the appropriateness of collecting various types of personal background information before granting access to classified information.

While the data reveal concern that the government classifies too many documents as secret and top secret, US citizens favor maintaining a high level of secrecy surrounding technology with military uses. Importantly, respondents generally expressed a high level of support for the government's right to ask personal background questions. It appears that current government personnel security policy in connection with granting access to classified information is in sync with the climate of public opinion. It seems unlikely that major public outcries against current background question procedures will occur.

Roger P. Denk
Director

Public Attitudes towards
Security and Counter-Espionage Matters
in the Post Cold War Period

Tom W. Smith

National Opinion Research Center
University of Chicago

November, 1994

This report was prepared as part of Office of Naval Research grant
N00014-94-1-0239.

50#A, auth: PERSEREC
(me. Zethop - DSN878-2448)
telecon, 11 May 95 CB

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By <u>per telecon</u>	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
P-1	

Introduction

In the post Cold War period when foreign threats to national security are widely perceived as diminished and political cynicism and anti-government sentiments are rampant, there are ample reasons to be concerned about public support for adequate security and counter-espionage measures. Does the public support prudent measures to protect secrets, screen employees for sensitive positions, and ferret out security risks and catch actual spies and traitors? Or are security measures seen as unnecessary, infringements of the rights of citizens in general and employees in particular, or as another example of governmental intrusion into the private lives of people?

To examine these issues the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) included a battery of 11 items on its 1994 General Social Survey (GSS). The items were drafted by researchers at the Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center in collaboration with NORC. The GSS is a nationally representative, full-probability sample of adults living in households in the United States. The 1994 GSS had a response rate of 78% and a sample size of 2992. The security items were administered to a random half of the total sample (the "B" sample), a total of 1474 respondents. Data were collected in February-April, 1994. Full technical details on the GSS are found in Davis and Smith, 1994.

Levels of Support for Security Measures

Overall support for security and counter-espionage measures is quite strong (Table 1). Only in terms of the classification of secrets does the majority favor the anti-security position. 56% believe that too many documents are classified as secret (Table 1 - Q.2). When it comes to protecting technologies with military applications, fully 76% back maintaining a "high level of secrecy" (Table 1 - Q.1).

There is even a stronger pro-security consensus when it comes to screening applicants for secret or top secret clearance (Table 1 - Q.4). Over 90% agree that the government should "have the right to ask...detailed, personal questions" about criminal arrests and convictions (98%), illegal drug use (96%), mental health history (95%), and alcohol use (93%). Somewhat smaller majorities endorse questioning about financial and credit history (82%) and foreign relatives and friends (78%). For all of these reasons except for the case of foreign connection, the majority definitely thinks the government has the right to question applicants. Only on the topic of sexual orientation is the public divided: 47% support inquiring about this topic, 50% oppose, and 2% are uncertain. Similarly, when asked to balance an applicant's right to privacy vs. the government's need to collect personal background information, the public overwhelmingly favors the government 80% to 15% with 5% unsure (Table 1 - Q. 5). At least when it concerns those who will be handling secrets, the public clearly and strongly favors national security over individual privacy and backs extensive

background checks.

The public also places the protection of secrets above the protection of co-workers. People were asked to consider a situation in which there is "a conflict between loyalty to one's employer and loyalty to a co-worker who is violating rules protecting secret and top secret information." In that circumstance 41% said the person should "report the co-worker to a company official" and another 41% favored asking the co-worker to stop, but reporting him or her if the misbehavior did not stop. Only 14% favor a weaker response. While people are evenly split between immediately reporting the errant co-worker and giving him or her a chance to stop the violation, the relative leniency of the latter group probably reflects the fact that the co-worker is not described as acting traitorously or even actually compromising secrets, but only as "violating rules protecting" secret information.

In sum, although the public believes the government classifies too many documents, people overwhelmingly back the protection of military-related technology, the detailed vetting of applicants for security clearance, and the reporting of employees who are violating security procedures.

The Association of Security Measures

As Table 2 shows, most of the security items are inter-related. Protecting military-related technology, not objecting to the amount of secret documents, asking detailed background questions, and reporting co-workers violating security procedures are all consistently related.¹ People favoring the protecting of secrets tend to support extensive background checks and do not object to the classification of documents.

However, a factor analysis with a varimax rotation does indicate that there is not a simple and general security dimension, but three somewhat distinct factors (Table 3). The first factor consists of the four asking items with the highest level of support (drugs, crime, alcohol, and mental health). The second factor is made up of the three asking items with lower support (sexual orientation, foreign connections, and finances). Asking about alcohol use, which is in the middle in terms of approval, loads fairly highly on both factors. The third factor consists of the remaining items (protecting military-related technology, classifying documents, reporting co-workers, and privacy vs. security checks). It is the weakest of the three factors (top loadings of only .65) and the item on individual rights to privacy has a low loading of -.43.

Table 4 shows the scales that we constructed from the 11 security items. The first two items are two scales made from the seven items on background checks. The first excludes Don't Knows and the second retains them by recoding them to the middle. We used the latter scale in subsequent analysis since it preserves more cases and had marginally higher associations with independent variables.² The third scale consists of the remaining security items. For both scales low values represent pro-security responses

and high scores indicate those opposed to protecting secrets and background checks.

Variables Related to Asking and Protecting Security Scales

Based on previous work in this area (Smith, 1993), we identified 12 areas that were expected to be associated with security attitudes. These are the Military, Government, Patriotism, Political Leanings, Religion, Crime and Punishment, Obedience, Civil Liberties, Personal Freedom and Deviance, Misanthropy, Work and Finances, and Demographics. These are designated as groups A-L in Tables 5 and 6. Table 5 indicates whether there is statistically significant variation in scale means across the selected variables. Table 6 presents the breakdowns for all variables that had a statistically significant relationship with at least one of the two security scales.

Military

Support for the military is strongly associated with supporting security measures. Favoring more defense spending and having more confidence in the military are related to both more support for background checks and pro-security positions.

Government

There is only a weak and irregular association between confidence in governmental institutions and security measures. Confidence in the executive branch of the federal government is not related to either security scale. Confidence in the legislature has non-linear and inconsistent relationships with security. Background checks are most supported by those with a great deal of confidence, but those with only some confidence show the least support. On the protecting scale support is highest for those with only some confidence and lowest for those with a great deal of confidence.

Patriotism

Generalized patriotism or national pride is strongly associated with favoring security measures. Those who are proud of being an American are much more supportive of both extensive vetting and the other security measures. Those who think America is better than other countries also are more supportive of background checks. However, for the other security measures the relationship is more complex. Pro-security positions are stronger among those who think America is both better and worse-off than other advanced countries and lowest for those who see America and others as equally well-off. Those who see America as ahead may want to maintain that lead by protecting our secrets and security and those who believe we are behind may see these measures as necessary to improve our position against foreign competition in general and espionage in particular.

Nativist patriotism has a weaker and less consistent association with security measures. Those who favor assimilation over pluralism and decreased immigration are more supportive of background checks, but attitudes towards government either assisting pluralism or assimilation are not related to approving of rigorous clearance procedures. Support for other protective security measures is also higher among those favoring assimilation and decreased immigration and somewhat greater among those who think groups should assimilate with governmental assistance.

Similarly, the four English vs. bilingualism items show that those who favor English are more supportive of both security scales.

Political Leanings

Political conservatives, Republicans, and Bush voters in 1992 are all more in favor of both security measures than those with centrist or liberal political leanings.

Religion

Religious conservatives (those who belong to Fundamentalist denominations and those who personally believe in Bible inerrancy) and those who attend church frequently are more supportive of background checks. The protective security scale has a weaker relationship with religion. Fundamentalists are more pro-security, but beliefs about the Bible has an irregular association and church attendance is not significantly associated with protective security measures.

Religious conservatism and involvement are probably related to strict vetting because Fundamentalists believe in personal sin and think that rigorous steps have to be taken to identify and weed out sinners. Since the element of moral weakness is less apparent in the protective security scale, these religion variables do not clearly differentiate in this case.

Crime and Punishment

Those who favor the tough punishment of criminals and assisting law enforcement efforts generally back stronger security measures. For background checks the association is less pronounced since only in the case of favoring capital punishment is the relationship statistically significant. For the protective security scale, more stringent measures are backed by those who want tougher courts, capital punishment, and more spending for law enforcement.

Obedience

Those who value obedience highly as a value to instil in children tend to favor both extensive background checks and strong counter-espionage measures. The strongest association comes for the measure rating "obedience and respect for authority" as the top

child values. It is likely the "respect for authority" dimension, which does not appear in the two other obedience items, de-emphasizes parental obedience and focuses attention more on obedience in general. This is supported by the fact that the obedience/respect item is more highly associated with general patriotism than are the two other obedience items.

Civil Liberties

Those who oppose civil liberties (free speech, employment as a college teacher, and allowing a book in the public library) for political extremists and social outgroups (those who are Communists, militarists, racists, anti-religionists, or homosexuals) tend to favor extensive background checks. Those who consider free speech a more important goal than maintaining public order and those with less confidence in the press are more supportive of other security measures. The other relationships tend to lean in a similar direction, but are not statistically significant.

Personal Freedom and Deviance

Those who oppose expressive freedom and deviant or non-traditional life styles tend to favor background checks and other protective security measures. People who disagree that "it is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don't like and to 'do their own thing,'" those opposing the legalization of marijuana, and those who think homosexuality is wrong and is a matter of individual choice are more in favor of background checks. Support for other protective security measures lean in the same directions, but only marijuana legalization and morality of homosexuality have statistically significant relationships.

Misanthropy

Counter to expectations judgments on whether people are trustworthy, fair, and helpful are not related to support for extensive vetting. Moreover, the two weak, but statistically significant, associations between trust and helpfulness and the protective security scale are the opposite of the hypothesized direction. Those who believe most people are trustworthy and helpful are more supportive of security measures.

Work and Finances

Low satisfaction with one's job or finances and recent financial downturns do not relate to either security scale. While those in security jobs who are dissatisfied with their employer or in a financial bind may well be greater security risks, generalized occupational or financial dissatisfaction does not undermine support for security measures.

Demographics

Of the nine demographics examined only gender is consistently related to both security scales. Men are more supportive of background checks and protective security measures than are women. Background checks are more supported by older adults, those from the South, and those with high school degrees or some college. It is unrelated to race, nativity, community type, or vocabulary score. Other protective measures are favored by Whites, college graduates, those with more verbal ability, and the native born. It is unrelated to age, region, community type, or parental nationality.

Education in particular has a very complex relationship to security items. Examining each of the 11 security items individually shows that education is unrelated to attitudes towards the classification of documents, the protection of technology, and asking about drug use and foreign connections. The better educated are more supportive of reporting errant co-workers, screening vs. personal privacy, and asking about crime. For asking about finances, mental health, and drinking support increases from among those with less than a high school education to a peak among those with some college, but then declines slightly among those with a college degree. Finally, support for asking about sexual orientation declines with education.

Summary

With multivariate controls support for extensive background checks is greater among males, Southerners, older adults, and political and religious conservatives. Rigorous vetting is more favored by those who are for the military, law and order, obedience and respect for authority, and patriotism. It is less supported by those who are more in favor of civil liberties, personal freedom, and deviant and permissive life styles.

Favoring other protective security measures is greater among the better educated, Whites, and political and religious conservatives. Support for security is higher among those who are pro-military, patriotic (both the proud and monolingual), and anti-crime. Other bivariate predictors discussed above (e.g. gender and obedience) do not appear as independent predictors in multivariate analysis.

The two security scales share a number of attitudinal correlates in common (being conservative, pro-military, anti-crime, patriotic), but notably differ in their overall pattern of association. First, demographic associations are quite different. Gender, region, and age are related to background checks, but education and race correlate with other security measures. Second, even when there is general consistency, the details are often divergent. For example, support for law and order is related to pro-security positions, but capital punishment is associated with background checks and favoring tougher courts is related to protective security measures. Similarly, religiousness is

associated with favoring security efforts, but more church attendance is associated with background checks, while being a member of a Fundamentalist church is related to other security measures. As a result, it is unwise to make many sweeping statements about the attributes and correlates of pro-security positions. Instead, more limited and nuanced assessments are needed.

Conclusion

Despite the end of the Cold War and widespread cynicism about government, there is substantial public support for strong security measures. Majorities support background inquiries for all topics except sexual orientation; security is seen as outweighing concerns about individual privacy and loyalty of co-workers (although many favor giving errant co-workers a chance to mend their ways); and the public supports the protection of military-related technology. Only regarding the over-classification of documents does the public look askance at security efforts.

This pattern indicates that most members of the public value security highly, favor prudent steps to maintain security, and even back intrusive and restrictive government policies where secrets and national security are involved. However, in most of the items examined here the public is assessing what security measures should be allowed in regards to those who handle or want to handle secrets. In such cases it tips the balance in favor of security and away from individual privacy and personal freedoms. In other circumstances the public would probably give more emphasis to these concerns (Smith, 1993). The majority that agrees that the government classifies too many documents as secret represents such a tipping away from security in favor of public access to information.

Security is not one, simple dimension in people's minds. Even among these 11 items, three related, but distinct, factors appeared: a high and low approval of background checks and other protective security measures.

Moreover, the complexity of security attitudes is demonstrated by the distinctive pattern of associates that the security scales have. In particular, different demographics relate to the background check and protective security scales and while these scales share a number of important attitudinal associates (being pro-military, politically and religiously conservative, patriotic, anti-crime), the details often are different. Thus, while one knows some of the general factors that associate with more support for security measures in general, it is more difficult to stipulate the precise attitudes that will lead to support for specific security measures. The complicated association of education with the 11 measures illustrates this point.

Endnotes

1. The negative signs in Table 2 reflect items coded in the opposite direction. When coded in a consistent manner, all correlations are positive and all but 7 of the 55 inter-item correlations are statistically significant.
2. While the asking question formed two factors, they differ essentially between items with high approval (drugs, crime, mental health, and drinking) and those with low to medium approval (sexual orientation, foreigners, and finances). Since these factors inter-correlated at .46-.47 and did not differ greatly in their association with other variables, they have been combined together into a single asking scale.

Table 1
Question Wordings and Distributions

1. In order to maintain America's leadership in the world, the government should maintain a high level of secrecy surrounding technology with military uses. Do you...

Strongly agree	34.8%
Agree	40.9
Neither agree nor disagree	11.7
Disagree	7.1
Strongly disagree	3.0
Don't Know	2.5

(1466)

2. Given the world situation, the government protects too many documents by classifying them as SECRET and TOP SECRET. Do you...

Strongly agree	13.9%
Agree	42.0
Neither agree nor disagree	17.1
Disagree	17.5
Strongly disagree	4.4
Don't Know	5.0

(1462)

3. When faced with a conflict between loyalty to one's employer and loyalty to a co-worker who is violating rules protecting SECRET and TOP SECRET information, a person should...

Report the co-worker to a company official	40.8%
Ask the co-worker to stop, but do nothing further	5.9
Ask the co-workers to stop, but report him/her if the behavior continues	41.4
Mind one's own business and not get involved	8.3
Don't Know	3.5

(1465)

Table 1 (continued)

4. Before giving an individual a SECRET or TOP SECRET clearance, the government should have the right to ask him or her detailed, personal questions in the following areas:

	Definitely Should	Probably Should	Probably Should Not	Definitely Should Not	Don't Know
Financial and credit history	54.9%	26.9	10.9	5.8	1.4
Criminal arrests and convictions	89.8%	8.4	0.6	0.4	0.8
Illegal drug use	84.7%	11.6	1.9	1.0	0.8
Mental health history	76.9%	17.9	3.3	0.7	1.1
Foreign relatives and friends	47.2%	30.7	12.7	7.2	2.2
Alcohol use	68.5%	24.1	4.6	2.1	0.7
Sexual orientation	28.7%	18.7	24.8	25.5	2.3

(1458-1460)

5. When faced with the conflict between an individual's right to privacy and the government's need to collect personal background information before giving a SECRET or TOP SECRET clearance, the government should...

Favor protecting an individual's right to privacy by not gathering information	14.9%
Favor the government's need to protect security by gathering information	80.1
Don't Know	5.0
	(1461)

Table 2
Inter-Item Correlations

	1	2	3	4a	4b	4c
Protect Tech. (1)	1.000	-.162**	.184**	.132**	.136*	.188**
Excess Secrets (2)		1.000	-.088**	-.045	-.050	-.043
Report Co-worker (3)			1.000	.120**	.149**	.159**
Ask Finances (4)				1.000	.283**	.231**
Ask Crimes					1.000	.524**
Ask Drugs						1.000
Ask Mental Health						
Ask Foreigners						
Ask Alcohol						
Ask Sex Orient.						
Ind. Rights (5)						
	4d	4e	4f	4g	5	
Protect Tech. (1)	.182**	.254**	.105**	.170**	-.169**	
Excess Secrets (2)	-.059*	-.042	-.013	-.046	.126**	
Report Co-worker	.087**	.197**	.136**	.029	-.142**	
Ask Finances (4)	.230**	.365**	.311**	.317**	-.176**	
Ask Crimes	.333**	.232**	.318**	.086**	-.161**	
Ask Drugs	.426**	.245**	.491**	.179**	-.192**	
Ask Mental Health	1.000	.325**	.419**	.254**	-.195**	
Ask Foreigners		1.000	.379**	.357**	-.233**	
Ask Alcohol			1.000	.309**	-.201**	
Ask Sex Orient.				1.000	-.145**	

*=Probability < .05

**=Probability < .01

Table 3

Factor Analysis
(varimax rotation)

	High Consensus Asking	Low/Medium Consensus Asking	Protecting Security
Protect Tech. (1)			.644
Excess Secrets (2)			-.652
Report Co-worker (3)			.572
Ask Finances (4)		.613	
Ask Crimes	.748		
Ask Drugs	.816		
Ask Mental Health	.595		
Ask Foreigners		.632	
Ask Alcohol	.641	(.427)	
Ask Sex Orient.		.811	
Ind. Rights (5)			-.430
Eigen Value	3.22	1.22	1.09

Notes: All factor loadings .4 and greater are shown. Secondary loadings are in parentheses.

Table 4
Distributions of Scales

**1. Additive Scale of Seven Items on Background
 Questions - Q.4 (Don't Knows Excluded)***

7	20.2%
8	7.3
9	10.3
10	14.9
11	9.5
12	8.8
13	8.3
14	6.2
15-19	12.9
20-27	1.5
Mean	10.9
	(1401)

*Minimum=7 (government definitely should be allowed to ask about all seven topics. Maximum=28 (government definitely should not be allowed to ask about all seven topics). Don't Knows excluded from scale.

**2. Additive Scale of Seven Items on Background
 Questions - Q.4 (Don't Knows Included)***

7	19.5%
8	7.1
9	10.2
10	14.4
11	9.6
12	8.7
13	8.5
14	6.2
15-19	13.7
20-27	2.1
Mean	11.0
	(1457)

*Minimum=7 (government definitely should be allowed to ask about all seven topics. Maximum=28 (government definitely should not be allowed to ask about all seven topics) Don't Knows recoded to 2.5 and kept in scale.

Table 4 (continued)

3. Additive Protecting Secrets Scale^b

4	2.5
5	5.6
6	8.4
7	13.8
8	18.4
9	15.0
10	7.3
11	9.0
12	6.9
13	5.8
14	2.7
15	1.7
16	1.8
17-20	1.1
Mean	9.1 (1371)

^bSum of Qs. 1, 2, 3, 5. Minimum score of 4 indicates most pro-security response to each item. Maximum score of 20 indicates that least pro-security response given for each item. Q. 2 is reversed coded (5=1; 4=2; 3=3; 2=4; 1=5). Q. 3 recoded (1=1; 2=4; 3=2; 4=5, DK=3). Q. 5 is recoded (2=1; DK=3; 1=5). DKS are excluded for Qs. 1 and 2 and included for Qs. 3 and 5.

4. Stouffer Civil Liberties Scale^c

15	24.6
16	9.6
17	6.2
18	6.3
19	6.5
20	7.0
21	5.5
22	4.5
23	4.0
24	5.9
25	3.8
26	3.2
27	3.4
28	2.8
29	2.5
30	4.2
Mean	20.0 (1659)

Table 4 (continued)

^aSum of 15 items on free speech, having book in public library, and teaching in college for Communists, militarist, racist, homosexual, and person against religion (GSS mnemonics - SPKCOM, LIBCOM, COLCOM, SPKMIL, LIBMIL, COLMIL, SPKRAC, LIBRAC, COLRAC, SPKHOMO, LIBHOMO, COLHOMO, SPKATH, LIBATH, COLATH). Score of 15 indicates that all groups should be allowed to speak, have book, and teach. Score of 30 indicates that no group should be allowed to do any of the actions.

Table 5

Association of Security Scales to Other Variables
(Probability Level)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
A. Military		
Military Spending (NATARMS)*	.000	.000
Confidence in Military (CONARMY)	.000	.000
B. Government		
Confidence in Executive (CONFED)	.189	.264
Confidence in Congress (CONLEGIS)	.008	.025
C. Patriotism		
America better than Most (AMRANK)	.000	.000
Proud to be American (AMPROUD)	.000	.000
Minorities should Assimilate (MELTPOT)	.036	.027
Govt help Racial/ethnic Groups Retain Their Cultures (GVTAPART)	.839	.312
Govt help Racial/ethnic Groups Blend In (GVTMELT)	.216	.007
Limit Number of Immigrants (LETIN)	.003	.003
Bilingual education (BILINGED)	.000	.000
Schools teach English (ENGTEACH)	.001	.001
Ballots in English Only (ENGBALLT)	.000	.000
English Official Language (ENGOFFCL)	.000	.000
D. Political Leanings		
Vote in 1992 Election (PRES92)	.000	.000
Party Identification (PARTYID)	.000	.000
Political Ideology (POLVIEWS)	.000	.000
E. Religion		
Church Attendance (ATTEND)	.002	.055
Fundamentalist Church (FUND)	.011	.009
Bible Inerrancy (BIBLE)	.003	.002

Table 5 (continued)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
F. Crime and Punishment		
Courts Should be Tougher (COURTS)	.256	.006
Capital Punishment (CAPPUN)	.000	.000
Govt Spending on Crime (NATCRIME)	.126	.008 ^b
G. Obedience		
Rank of Parental Obedience (OBEY)	.029	.359
Children Should Obey or Think for Themselves (OBEYTHNK)	.010	.180
Obedience and Respect for Authority Top Child Values (OBRESPCT)	.000	.000
H. Civil Liberties		
Civil Liberties for Extremist Groups (See Table 4)	.000	.066
Freedom of Speech vs. Maintaining Order (POSTMAT1)	.172	.001
Confidence in Press (CONPRESS)	.221	.010
I. Personal Freedom and Deviance		
People Do Own Thing (OWNTHING)	.002	.222
Legalize Marijuana (GRASS)	.000	.004
Morality of Homosexuality (HOMOSEX)	.000	.004
Homosexuality Fixed or Changeable (HOMOCHNG)	.000	.310
J. Misanthropy		
Most People Trustworthy (TRUST)	.457	.038
Most People Fair (FAIR)	.393	.083
Most People Helpful (HELPFUL)	.209	.019
K. Work and Finances		
Satisfaction with Job (SATJOB)	.118	.803
Satisfaction with Finances (SATFIN)	.143	.780
Changes in Finances (FINALTER)	.077	.984

Table 5 (continued)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
L. Demographics		
Age (AGE)	.000	.661
Gender (SEX)	.000	.000
Race (RACE)	.265	.000
Region (REGION)	.001	.599
Community Type (SRCBELT)	.410	.050
Years of Schooling (EDUC)	.017	.027
Vocabulary Score (WORDSUM)	.628	.005
Born in USA (BORN)	.884	.004
Parents Born in USA (PARBORN)	.084	.190

^aGSS mnemonics in parentheses, see Davis and Smith, 1994.

^bA parallel item on spending on crime prevention (NATCRIME) was related to asking and protecting at respectively the .131 and .000 levels.

Table 6
Breakdowns of Security Scales by Other Variables

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
A. Military		
Military Spending (NATARMS)	L	L
Too little	9.82	8.02
About right	10.88	8.83
Too much	11.77	10.02
Confidence in Military (CONARMY)	L	L
Great deal	10.43	8.54
Only some	11.23	9.13
Hardly any	12.12	10.42
B. Government		
Confidence in Congress (CONLEGIS)	NL	NL
Great deal	10.17	10.04
Only some	11.37	9.00
Hardly any	10.86	9.03
C. Patriotism		
America better than Most (AMRANK)	LC	NL
America better	10.82	8.97
About the same	11.91	9.62
Others better	11.51	8.83
Proud to be American (AMPROUD)	L	L
Extremely proud	10.59	8.63
Very proud	11.10	9.21
Somewhat proud	12.18	10.18
Not very proud	12.85	10.29
Minorities should		
Assimilate (MELTPOT)	L	NL
Keep Distinct Cultures	11.18	9.47
2	11.00	9.10
3	11.39	9.13
4	11.24	9.17
5	11.02	8.55
6	10.70	8.75
Assimilate	10.35	9.33

Table 6 (continued)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
Govt help Racial/ethnic Groups		
Blend In (GVTMELT)	NS	L
Government help	11.01	9.55
Groups do on own	10.57	8.71
Number of Immigrants		
(LETIN)	LC	L
Increased a lot	10.48	9.64
Increased a little	11.49	9.75
Same as now	11.26	9.36
Decreased a little	11.20	9.02
Decreased a lot	10.52	8.71
Bilingual education (BILINGED)	NL	L
Strongly favor	11.03	9.55
Somewhat favor	11.27	9.05
Somewhat oppose	11.20	8.85
Strongly oppose	10.00	8.35
Schools teach English (ENGTEACH)	L	L
Only English	10.52	8.77
A few years in non-English	11.19	9.08
Continuing non-English	11.33	9.62
Ballots in English Only (ENGBALLT)	L	L
Only English	10.54	8.52
In other languages	11.31	9.40
English Official Language		
(ENGOFFCL)	LC	L
Favor	10.54	8.67
Neither favor nor oppose	11.85	9.11
Oppose	11.65	9.98
D. Political Leanings		
Vote in 1992 Election (PRES92)	X	X
Clinton	11.45	9.50
Bush	10.07	8.15
Perot	10.83	8.99

Table 6 (continued)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
Party Identification (PARTYID)	LC	L
Strong Democrat	11.47	9.66
Democrat	11.27	9.50
Leaning Democrat	11.44	9.71
Independent	11.65	8.96
Leaning Republican	10.53	8.67
Republican	10.84	8.55
Strong Republican	9.64	8.05
Political Ideology (POLVIEWS)	L	L
Extremely liberal	11.92	10.99
Liberal	12.20	9.83
Slightly liberal	11.30	9.37
Moderate	10.99	9.13
Slightly conservative	11.04	8.96
Conservative	10.11	8.35
Extremely conservative	9.65	7.50
E. Religion		
Church Attendance (ATTEND)	L	NS
Never	11.58	9.30
LT once a year	10.58	8.90
Once a year	11.33	9.08
Several times a year	11.34	9.20
Once a month	10.98	9.13
2-3 times a month	11.39	9.56
Nearly every week	10.44	8.80
Every week	10.65	9.11
More than once a week	10.15	8.16
Fundamentalist Church (FUND)	L	L
Fundamentalist	10.64	8.81
Moderate	11.11	9.09
Liberal	11.32	9.44
Bible Inerrancy (BIBLE)	L	NL
Literal word of God	10.64	9.32
Inspired word of God	11.07	8.89
Fables, etc.	11.69	9.14

Table 6 (continued)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
F. Crime and Punishment		
Courts Should be Tougher (COURTS)	NS	L
Too harsh	11.76	9.99
About right	11.08	9.63
Not harsh enough	10.92	8.97
Capital Punishment (CAPPUN)	L	L
Favor	10.70	8.83
Oppose	12.11	9.72
Govt Spending on Law Enforcement (NATCRIMY)	NS	L
Too little	11.14	8.79
About right	10.94	9.41
Too much	12.06	10.63
G. Obedience		
Rank of Parental Obedience (OBEY)	L	NS
First	10.43	8.84
Second	10.69	9.31
Third	11.23	9.05
Fourth	11.37	9.00
Fifth	11.40	9.48
Children Should Obey or Think for Themselves (OBEYTHNK)	L	NS
Be Obedient	10.65	9.21
Think for Themselves	11.16	8.98
Obedience and Respect for Authority Top Child Values (OBRESPCT)	L	LC
Strongly agree	10.57	8.97
Agree	11.01	8.94
Disagree	11.95	9.46
Strongly disagree	11.90	11.07
H. Civil Liberties		
Civil Liberties for Extremist Groups (See Table 4)	LC	NS
15	10.96	8.69
16-19	11.76	9.25
20-24	10.75	9.26
25-30	9.82	8.94

Table 6 (continued)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
Priority of Free Speech vs. Maintaining Order (POSTMAT1)	NS	X
Maintain order	10.66	8.66
Give people more say	11.08	9.32
Control prices	11.07	9.42
Protect free speech	11.16	8.99
Confidence in Press (CONPRESS)	NS	LC
Great deal	11.07	9.02
Only some	11.27	9.35
Hardly any	10.86	8.76
I. Personal Freedom and Deviance		
People Do Own Thing (OWNTHING)	L	NS
Strongly agree	11.35	9.44
Agree	11.23	9.05
Disagree	10.83	9.05
Strongly disagree	10.02	8.76
Legalize Marijuana (GRASS)	L	L
Legalize	11.98	9.66
Not legalize	10.83	8.91
Morality of Homosexuality (HOMOSEX)	L	L
Always wrong	10.41	8.81
Almost always wrong	11.77	9.65
Wrong only sometimes	12.10	9.93
Not wrong at all	11.77	9.32
Homosexuality Fixed or Changeable (HOMOCHNG)	L	NS
People choose it	10.38	9.02
People can't change	11.54	9.22
J. Misanthropy		
Most People Trustworthy (TRUST)	NS	L
Can trust	11.30	8.78
Depends	11.00	9.66
Can't trust	11.22	9.21
Most People Helpful (HELPFUL)	NS	NL
Most helpful	11.27	8.89
Depends	10.51	9.97
Lookout for self	11.03	9.19

Table 6 (continued)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
L. Demographics		
Age (AGE)	L	NS
18-29	11.89	9.29
30-39	11.19	9.06
40-49	10.91	9.06
50-64	10.39	9.10
65+	10.67	8.88
Gender (SEX)	L	L
Male	10.44	8.82
Female	11.57	9.35
Race (RACE)	NS	X
White	10.97	8.87
Black	11.28	10.34
Other	11.52	9.72
Region (REGION)	X	NS
New England	12.15	9.55
Mid Atlantic	11.41	9.11
East North Central	11.49	9.28
West North Central	10.91	9.07
South Atlantic	10.56	8.86
East South Central	10.39	8.74
West South Central	10.95	9.27
Mountain	10.48	8.91
Pacific	11.14	9.15
Years of Schooling (EDUC)	NL	L
Less than high school	11.52	9.44
High school	10.90	9.24
Some college	10.69	8.98
College graduate	11.18	8.79
Vocabulary Score (WORDSUM)	NS	L
0 correct	9.90	8.60
1	11.83	9.81
2	11.64	10.68
3	11.73	10.52
4	10.64	9.50
5	10.93	8.94
6	11.16	8.97
7	10.72	8.74
8	11.27	9.13
9	10.85	8.63
10 correct	11.37	9.11

Table 6 (continued)

	Asking Scale	Protecting Security Scale
Born in USA (BORN)	NS	L
Yes	11.03	9.02
No	11.08	9.90

L=Linear

LC=Linear component - statistically significant linearity, but also statistically significant variation from best linear fit.

NL=Non-linear

NS=Not statistically significant

X=Not applicable, nominal variable

References

Davis, James A. and Smith, Tom W., General Social Surveys, 1972-1994: Cumulative Codebook. Chicago: NORC, 1994.

Smith, Tom W., "Security Awareness and the Climate of Public Opinion: An Analysis of Recent Trends," Report prepared for the Office of Naval Research, August, 1993.